UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,838	12/27/2001	Sherrie L. Woodring	87264.3061	9843

30734	7590	10/17/2005

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
WASHINGTON SQUARE, SUITE 1100
1050 CONNECTICUT AVE. N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5304

EXAMINER
HALIYUR, VENKATESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2664	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/026,838	WOODRING ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Venkatesh Haliyur	2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 December 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 December 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1 page</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 20 have been examined.

Priority

2.   Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application 60/297,438 06/13/2001

is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Blumenau et al [US Pat: 6,421,711] in view of Tams et al [US Pat: 6,862,286].

Regarding claims1-4, 13-16, Blumenau et al disclosed a method and system in

their invention of "Virtual ports for data transferring of a data storage system" a

mechanism for automatically detecting certain changes of state in Fibre Channel

including that of an assignment change, topology change and mapping a user defined

port address and associating it with an address identifier. Blumenau et al also disclosed

a method for initiating (triggering) a command based on configuration (topology) change

detection to map the address identifier to user defined port name [Figures 1-3, column

9, lines 18-67,column 10, column 11, lines 1-55, column 31, lines 44-67,column 32,

lines 1-31]. Blumenau et al disclosed that ports communicate with the network using

management protocol (SNMP) to report changes in configuration [column 8, lines 12-22]

and fibre channel address identifier comprises of D_ID and S_ID [item 401,402 of Fig

34, column 10, lines 52-60], but fails to disclose monitoring topology change trap to map

address identifier to user defined port name.

However, Tams et al in their invention of "Tracking dynamic addresses on a

network" disclosed a method for monitoring the dynamic address changes in the

network and reporting such changes to the network manager for the purposes of

mapping current port and subsequent port to associated address identifier [column 3,

lines 26-67, column 4, lines 1-50].

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

that the invention was made to include the method of monitoring and mapping dynamic

address changes as taught by Tams et al in the system of Blumenau et al to monitor

topology change trap when a port becomes associated with an address identifier and

triggering a command based on a detected topology change trap to map address

identifier to user defined port name.

Regarding claims 5,6,17,18, Blumenau et al disclosed storing (recording) of the

user-defined port name as a field data reported by network management (monitoring)

system such as SNMP [Fig 5, column 10, lines 34-51, column 13, lines 22-37, lines

column 23, lines 8-29], but fails to disclose that monitoring system comprises at least

one probe.

However, Tams et al disclosed a monitoring system consisting of a RMON2 probes to retrieve trapped revised address identifiers associated with the user port stored in MIB during a configuration change [item 23 of Fig 5, column 3, lines 25-37].

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include a probe in the monitoring system as taught by Tams et al in the system of Blumenau et al to trap and record changes in the port assignment.

Regarding claim 7, Blumenau et al in their system disclosed generating data referring to user-defined port names for the purposes of storing and viewing changes in configuration (topology) and for mapping the revised address identifiers associated with user defined ports using a graphical user interface (GUI) [column 28, lines 61-67, columns 29, lines 1-17, column 30, lines 20 - 58], but fails to disclose a probing mechanism in the monitoring system.

However, Tams et al disclosed a monitoring system consisting of RMON2 probe to retrieve trapped address identifiers associated with the user port stored in MIB if a configuration change (topology) had occurred [item 23 of Fig 5, column 3, lines 25-37].

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include a probe in the monitoring system to trap configuration changes (topology) as taught by Tams et al in the system of Blumenau et al to detect and store revised address identifiers associated with the user defined port name by the monitoring system.

Regarding claims 8-12,19,20, Blumenau et al disclosed a controller (hardware device) is used for probing the ports with a simple network management protocol SNMP [column 10, lines 28-33, column 13, lines 22-27, column 35, lines, 25-33], Blumenau et al also disclosed user-defined port name is generated as a field for data collection and this data is stored (archived) and this data is used to view (generate) reports [Fig 24, columns 23-26, column 30, lines 40-44], but fails to disclose the probe as a software device. However, Tamps et al disclosed that the RMON2 monitoring system probe consists of both hardware and software facility (device) [item 23, of fig 5, lines column 3, lines 25-31].

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include a probe that consists of hardware and monitoring software as taught by Tams et al in the system of Blumenau et al for the purposes of probing and detecting changes in the address identifiers associated with the user defined ports.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art in reference here are Blumenau et al and Tams et al.

1.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the attention to Venkatesh Haliyur whose phone number is 571-272-8616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached @ (571)-272-3134. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-2600 or fax to 571-273-8300.

2.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner